

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated July 15, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sheard et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,453,356) and Smith (U.S. Patent No. 6,604,104), respectively. Claims 3-5, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Sheard and claims 6 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Sheard and Smith combined.

With this response, Applicants cancel claims 1-15 and, consequently, Applicants submit that the rejections as to these claims are moot. However, Applicants hereby add new claims 16-29 and submit that these claims are patentable over the cited art for at least the following reasons.

Sheard teaches a system and method for exchanging data between two or more applications through use of a data exchange engine. In Sheard, each of the applications has an associated adapter that is "customized to interface with a corresponding application and transforms data being transferred between the application and the data exchange engine." Abstract. As shown in Fig. 1, in Sheard, adapters are used to translate all data going into the data exchange engine into a "common or generic form which is subsequently operated on by the data exchange engine 32." Col. 5, lines 61-63. Adapters are also used to reformulate selected informational content back into the format required by a particular application. Col. 6, lines 5-9. Therefore, in Sheard, data is necessarily transformed twice -- once going into the data exchange engine and once coming out. Furthermore, all data is transformed, not just data that will be used by a particular recipient application. Applicants submit that Sheard does not teach or suggest "determining based on one or more document

attributes and the at least one document subscription which, if any, of the listener modules have subscribed to receive information from the electronic document," or "extracting only that information that the listener module requires." For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that new claims 16-29 are patentable over Sheard.

New claims 16-29 are similarly patentable over Smith. According to Smith, a translation module 16 may reformat data received from distributed source database modules into a format for receipt by operational data store module 18. Col. 4, lines 19-32. Smith, however, does not teach or suggest, for example, "determining based on one or more document attributes and the at least one document subscription which, if any, of the listener modules have subscribed to receive information from the electronic document," or "extracting only that information that the listener requires." For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claims 16-29 are patentable over Smith, alone or in combination with Sheard.


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: October 15, 2004

By 
Linda J. Thayer
Reg. No. 45,681